



# 2017 Annual Reports for Tennessee Educator Preparation Providers

Technical Guide

Tennessee Department of Education | May 2018

## ***Table of Contents***

<a href="#"><u>Executive Summary</u></a>	3
<a href="#"><u>Annual Reports Generation</u></a>	4
<a href="#"><u>Data Included in the 2017-18 Annual Reports</u></a>	4
<a href="#"><u>Data Collection Process</u></a>	5
<a href="#"><u>Annual Reports – Insights Tool</u></a>	9
<a href="#"><u>Domain 1: Candidate Recruitment and Selection</u></a>	10
<a href="#"><u>Domain 2: Completer Employment and Retention</u></a>	13
<a href="#"><u>Domain 3: Candidate Assessment</u></a>	17
<a href="#"><u>Domain 4: Completer, Employer, and Partner Satisfaction</u></a>	19
<a href="#"><u>Domain 5: Completer Effectiveness</u></a>	21
<a href="#"><u>Annual Reports – Performance Report</u></a>	24
<a href="#"><u>Domains, Metrics, and Metric Expectations</u></a>	24
<a href="#"><u>Domain and Overall Expectations</u></a>	26
 List of Tables	
Table 1: Annual Reports General Terms and Definitions	6
Table 2: Insights Tool – Domain 1: Metric Label and Definition	10
Table 3: Insights Tool – Domain 2: Metric Label and Definition	13
Table 4: Insights Tool – Domain 3: Metric Label and Definition	17
Table 5: Insights Tool – Domain 4: Metric Label and Definition	19
Table 6: TEAM Score Conversion	21
Table 7: Insights Tool – Domain 5: Metric Label and Definition	22
Table 8: Performance Report – Domains, Metrics, and Metric Expectations	24
Table 9: Performance Report – Domain and Overall Expectations	26
Table 10: Performance Report – Domain Expectations	27

## ***Executive Summary***

Since 2008, Tennessee has produced report cards on the performance of Tennessee educator preparation providers (EPPs) that have included information related to candidate academic profile (e.g., GPA and ACT data), placement and retention data, and completer performance data (i.e., individual growth score data). In 2016, the State Board of Education (board) led the redesign of the Report Card to provide a tool that is user-friendly, focused, informative, and accessible. The [\*Teacher Preparation Report Card\*](#) (Report Card) identifies an overall performance category for Tennessee EPPs based on scoring metrics across three domains.<sup>1</sup> The Report Card is designed primarily for external stakeholders, such as prospective teacher candidates and school districts, to support their understanding of the overall performance of Tennessee's EPPs.

The Tennessee Department of Education (department) recognized a need to create a set of reports focused on supporting EPP efforts to continuously improve. In addition, while the *Teacher Preparation Report Card* is not directly tied to a formal part of the accountability process, the [\*Educator Preparation Policy \(5.504\)\*](#) sets the expectations that Annual Reports will be used in this process. As a result, the department developed the *Annual Reports for Tennessee Educator Preparation Providers* (Annual Reports). Driven by the charge from the board to connect these reports to the accountability structure, the 2017 Annual Reports are divided into two components, the ***Insights Tool*** and the ***Performance Report***. The *Insights Tool* provides EPPs with detailed information to support continuous improvement. The *Performance Report* provides EPPs, the state, and review teams with data that can be used to inform the decision to conduct an interim review between program review cycles when an EPP consistently falls below expectations and inform approval recommendations during comprehensive reviews. Specifically, the policy (5.504) requires that EPPs engage in an interim review process if expectations are not met on the Annual Reports for two consecutive years.

In 2015, the department convened a group of stakeholders (Educator Preparation Working Group or EPWG), including representatives from EPP faculty and local education agencies, to define the set of metrics that would be included in the new Annual Reports. In 2016-17, the group also supported the development of specific expectations for the *Performance Report*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ultimately, the report card will provide information on four domains and additional indicators. To learn more about the *Teacher Preparation Report Card*, visit: <http://teacherprepreportcard.tn.gov>.

These reports provide EPPs with information on five domains that each include multiple indicators. In addition to reporting at the EPP level, the *Insights Tool* offers data disaggregated by clusters of specialty area programs (e.g., middle grades, special populations) and for individual specialty area programs (e.g., biology, secondary mathematics). The *Insights Tool* also provides EPPs with observation data for educators employed either post-program completion or while enrolled in a program with a job-embedded clinical practice. These data are disaggregated by indicator on the most frequently used state observation rubric. This level of information was not made available to EPPs prior to the release of the Annual Reports.

The detailed, disaggregated data provide EPPs actionable information that can be used to identify program outcomes, impacts that are particularly strong, and areas where there are opportunities for improvement. By disaggregating this data, EPPs should be able to focus efforts on specific programs or program components. Finally, the department expects that over time, not only will these reports provide individual programs with information to support continuous improvement, but also that these reports can be used collectively to identify elements of program design that are associated with the development of effective educators. Ultimately, all of Tennessee's EPPs and their candidates, Tennessee's districts and schools, and most importantly, Tennessee's students, will benefit from turning this data into information that supports the improvement of educator preparation across the state.

## ***Annual Reports Generation***

The 2017-18 Annual Reports were developed by the Tennessee Department of Education with support from the State Board of Education and educator preparation providers. The primary sources of data used in the Annual Reports were collected by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission for the 2015 *Report Card on the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs* and the board for the 2016 and 2017 *Teacher Preparation Report Cards*. In addition, the University of Tennessee, Knoxville's Boyd Center for Business and Economic Research (BCBER) supported in the analysis of employment and retention data for Domain 2.

### **Data Included in the 2017-18 Annual Reports**

The 2017-18 Annual Reports include data from three cohorts of preparation completers and candidates:

- **Cohort 1** includes individuals who completed preparation between Sept. 1, 2013 and Aug. 31, 2014.

- **Cohort 2** includes individuals who completed preparation and those who were candidates enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs between Sept. 1, 2014 and Aug. 31, 2015.
- **Cohort 3** includes individuals who completed preparation and those who were candidates enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs between Sept. 1, 2015 and Aug. 31, 2016.

In most cases, data points included on the Annual Reports are representative of all three cohorts. Tool tips, boxes of information that appear when a user scrolls over a data point, allow the user to view each cohort separately. Moving forward, three years of data will continue to be included on the reports with older cohorts removed while new cohorts are added.

As noted in the 2016 *Teacher Preparation Report Card*, a significant shift between the 2015 and 2016 data collection processes was the inclusion of educators who are enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs. These individuals qualify for a Tennessee teaching license and serve as teacher-of-record while completing preparation. These individuals were not consistently reported in previous years.

Metric values on Annual Reports were suppressed if fewer than ten people from an EPP were identified as being included in the metric. This is often the case when data are disaggregated at a granular level such as endorsement area or clinical type. Like the Report Card, instructional leader preparation program completers are not included in the Annual Reports, however, Annual Reports for instructional leader preparation programs are currently in development

### **Data Collection Process**

Each EPP provided initial data for the Report Card to the state board. Providers submitted a roster of individuals who completed their preparation programs; in the case of cohorts 2 and 3, this roster also included job-embedded enrolled candidates. In addition, EPPs provided key demographic and assessment information for all cohort members. The board collaborated with EPPs to verify the accuracy of their data submissions. Multiple state databases were used to gather additional information on the reported completers, including license number, observation scores, individual growth scores, and employment data. These data serve as the foundation for the Annual Reports. In addition to data obtained through state databases for the production of the Report Card, the Annual Reports include assessment data obtained from Educational Testing Services (ETS). Finally, the Annual Reports also include perception data collected through the department's spring [2017 Tennessee Educator Survey](#) (candidate satisfaction data) and the fall 2017 *District Survey* (local education agency (LEA) partner satisfaction data).

**Table 1: Annual Reports General Terms and Definitions**

General Terms and Definitions	
<b><i>Clinical Practice</i></b>	<p>Clinical practice refers to intensive field-based responsibilities, assignments, tasks, activities, and assessments. These experiences help students develop and demonstrate their preparedness to be effective educators. There are three types of clinical practice: student teaching, internship, and job-embedded.</p> <p><i>Student Teaching</i> – Student teaching offers extended opportunity for classroom experience while the student earns course credit toward a degree or certification. Student teaching involves a planned semester of at least 15 weeks that includes full-day teaching and observation activities.</p> <p><i>Internship</i> – Internships require a full year of clinical practice during which the intern engages in direct teaching activities for at least 100 school days. Activities related to this experience may include classroom teaching, observation, coursework, seminars, and planning.</p> <p><i>Job-Embedded</i> – Job-embedded candidates receive a license and serve as a teacher-of-record while enrolled in and completing preparation. The 2016-17 Annual Reports include both <i>job-embedded enrolled</i> and <i>job-embedded completed</i> candidates. Candidates reported as <i>completed</i> finished program requirements during the reporting window for the Annual Reports, while <i>enrolled</i> have not completed, and remain in preparation beyond the end of the reporting period. For the purpose of disaggregating data by clinical type on the 2016-17 Annual Reports, candidates identified as <i>enrolled</i> and <i>completed</i> are combined.</p>
<b><i>Completer</i></b>	<p>A completer is any teacher preparation program candidate who has completed licensure requirements and been endorsed for licensure by an EPP in one of the cohorts included in the Annual Reports. The 2017 Annual Reports include completers from the 2013-14 academic year (cohort 1), the 2014-15 academic year (cohort 2), and the 2015-16 academic year. Those who participated in instructional leader preparation programs are not considered completers in these reports.</p>
<b><i>Domain</i></b>	<p>Domain is used throughout the Annual Reports as a group of subdomains that are considered together based on the related nature of their meaning.</p>

<b><i>Educator Preparation Provider (EPP)</i></b>	Educator preparation providers, also referred to as providers or EPPs, are the universities, colleges, and education-related organizations (EROs) that prepare Tennessee educators. The Annual Reports are produced for providers that are approved for licensure through the program approval process outlined in the Educator Preparation Policy (5.504) adopted by the State Board of Education. The Annual Reports build on the reporting levels available in the Report Card by displaying data at the provider level, the licensure (endorsement) program level within each EPP, and clusters of licensure (endorsement) programs within each EPP. In addition, the Annual Reports allow providers to disaggregate cohort 2 and 3 data by clinical type and program type. Due to suppression rules, some providers may not be able to view some disaggregated metrics.
<b><i>Endorsement Area</i></b>	Endorsement areas indicate the subject and/or grade level for which a licensed educator is prepared to provide instruction, leadership, or services in schools or districts. When applying for licensure, each teacher candidate must meet requirements in at least one area of endorsement, though many are endorsed in multiple areas.
<b><i>Level of Overall Effectiveness</i></b>	Level of overall effectiveness (LOE) is an evaluation rating that all teachers receive annually. For more information, visit <a href="http://team-tn.org">http://team-tn.org</a> .
<b><i>Metric</i></b>	Metric is used throughout the Annual Reports as the calculation performed to quantify a numeric value for a subdomain.
<b><i>Program Type</i></b>	Three program types are included in the Annual Reports for cohorts 2 and 3: <i>undergraduate</i> , <i>post-baccalaureate non-degree</i> , and <i>post-baccalaureate degree</i> .
<b><i>Subdomain</i></b>	Subdomain is used throughout the Annual Reports as a specific measure within a domain that is quantified to assess provider and program performance.
<b><i>Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) Evaluation System</i></b>	The Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) is the system and rubric used to evaluate most Tennessee public school educators. TEAM is a comprehensive, student outcomes-based evaluation system that is designed to promote continuous improvement in the classroom. TEAM utilizes observation data and student assessment data in order to fairly evaluate educators and provide a broad view of educator effectiveness, incorporating both pedagogical effectiveness and student performance growth. More information on this model can be found on the TEAM website at <a href="http://team-tn.org">http://team-tn.org</a> . In addition to the TEAM system, some districts use alternative models such as TEM and Project COACH. While

	<p>rubrics may vary, these models have been approved by the state board as acceptable models to use in the evaluation process. Note that the Annual Reports only include domain and indicator-level observation data for teachers who were observed using the TEAM rubric.</p>
<p><b><i>Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS)</i></b></p>	<p>The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) measures the impact that teachers have on their students' academic progress. Rather than measuring proficiency, TVAAS specifically captures student growth to better represent the effect that teachers and their schools can have on students. TVAAS is scored from Levels 1-5, with Level 1 representing <i>least effective</i>, Level 3 representing <i>average effectiveness</i>, and Level 5 representing <i>most effective</i>.</p>



## ***Annual Reports – Insights Tool***

The *Insights Tool* allows EPPs to examine completer data by cohort, program, endorsement, and clinical type to better understand the impact and effectiveness of the teacher preparation program. The Insights Tool provides data to EPPs across five domains, with metrics within each domain to further drill down data about candidates across three cohorts of program completers, beginning with 2013-14.

The five domains within the *Insights Tool* include Candidate Recruitment, Employment and Retention, Candidate Assessment, Completer Satisfaction, and Completer Impact and Effectiveness. Combined, these domains represent the broad scope of preparation and experience for educators in the state of Tennessee. The metrics within each of the domains provide a deep dive into candidate data.

### **Domain 1: Candidate Recruitment and Selection**

*Subdomains:* Admissions Assessment, Race and Ethnicity, Gender, and High-Needs Endorsement Areas.

### **Domain 2: Employment and Retention**

*Subdomains:* Overall Employment Rate, First Year Employment Rate, and Two Year Employment Rate

### **Domain 3: Candidate Assessment**

*Subdomains:* Pedagogical Assessment, Literacy Assessment, and Specialty Area Assessment

### **Domain 4: Completer, Partner, and Employer Satisfaction**

*Subdomains:* LEA Partner Satisfaction and Completer Satisfaction

### **Domain 5: Completer Effectiveness and Impact**

*Subdomains:* Overall Evaluation Ratings, TVAAS Ratings, Observation Ratings, Average Observation Domain Scores, and Average Observation Indicator Scores

## Insights Tool

### Domain 1: Candidate Recruitment and Selection

#### General Notes

- The data for the 2017 Annual Reports were collected from EPPs as part of the 2016-17 data collection process that was facilitated by the State Board of Education in preparation for the 2017 Teacher Preparation Report Card.
- These metrics use data obtained for completers and educators enrolled in job-embedded preparation programs. As a result, these metrics do not reflect the admitted cohort of candidates for each EPP. For example, this process did not collect GPA data for individuals who were admitted to the preparation program, but did not complete the program. Assessing this information could further illuminate the relationship between selection characteristics and successful program completion. In the future, the department will develop a plan for collecting data on individuals who have been admitted to an educator preparation program.

**Table 2: Insights Tool - Domain 1: Metric Label and Definition**

Subdomain	Metric Label and Definition	
<b>Admissions Assessment</b>	<i>Percentage with ACT of 21+</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with a reported ACT score of 21 or greater by the total number of individuals with a reported ACT score.
	<i>Percentage with SAT of 1020+</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the number of individuals with a reported SAT score of 1020 or greater by the total number of individuals with a reported SAT score.
	<i>Average GRE score</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the sum of reported GRE scores by the total number of individuals with a reported GRE score.
	<i>Percentage passed Praxis Core (reading, writing, and math)</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the number of passing scores for individual Praxis Core tests by the total number of Praxis Core scores reported.
	<i>Percentage of candidates with 2.75+</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with a 2.75 or higher undergraduate GPA by

	<i>undergraduate GPA</i>	the total number of individuals with any undergraduate GPA.
	<i>Average program GPA</i>	Based on data reported by EPPs, this metric is calculated by dividing the sum total of average program GPAs by the total number of program GPAs reported.
<b>Race and Ethnicity</b>	<i>Percentage of completers in underrepresented racial and ethnic categories and distribution of completers by race and ethnicity</i>	<p>This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with a race and ethnicity reported other than <i>White</i> by the total number of individuals with a reported race or ethnicity.</p> <p>The metric that represents the distribution of completers by race and ethnicity is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals within each reported racial or ethnic group by the total number of individuals with a reported race or ethnicity.</p>
<b>Gender</b>	<i>Percentage of male completers and distribution of completers by gender</i>	<p>This metric is calculated by dividing the number of male completers by the total number of individuals with a reported gender.</p> <p>The distribution of completers by gender metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals within each reported gender by the total number of individuals with a reported gender.</p>
<b>High-needs Endorsement</b>	<i>Percentage of completers endorsed in high-needs subject areas</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the number of individuals with a high-needs endorsement reported by the total number of individuals with an endorsement reported.

### **Additional Metric-Specific Information**

*Percentage of completers in underrepresented racial and ethnic categories and distribution of completers by race or ethnicity*

- Individuals for whom ethnicity was identified as Hispanic/Latino were included in the underrepresented racial and ethnic category regardless of the identified race.
- Individuals without an identified race or ethnicity were not included in the denominator for this metric.

*Percentage of completers endorsed in high-needs subject areas*

- The following endorsement codes are identified as high-needs subject areas:
  - English as a Second Language (490);
  - Secondary Math (125, 413);
  - Secondary Science (Biology (126, 415), Chemistry (127, 416), and Physics (129, 417));
  - Spanish (169, 409, 495); and
  - Special Education (Modified (460), Comprehensive (461), and Interventionist (144,145)).

# Insights Tool

## Domain 2: Completer Employment and Retention

### General Notes

- This data was collected using a combination of resources, including administrative and licensure data synthesized by the University of Tennessee, Knoxville's Boyd Center for Business and Economic Research (BCBER) and evaluation and licensure data stored in TNCompass. In addition, all completers with a TVAAS score are counted toward this metric (i.e. if an individual was identified as having a TVAAS rating, but may not have been identified in staffing databases, they were counted as employed).
- BCBER used social security numbers (SSN) to match data from cohort 1, cohort 2, and cohort 3 to employment data. Because SSNs are self-reported by EPPs, there is a possibility of inaccurate matching. In the future, the department will utilize data directly from TNCompass, which will be verified by EPPs for accuracy.
- Employment and retention metrics are based solely on employment in a Tennessee public school.

**Table 3: Insights Tool - Domain 2: Metric Label and Definition**

Subdomain	Metric Label and Definition	
<b>Overall Employment Rate</b>	<i>Percentage employed within three years</i>	<p>This metric represents the percentage of completers with a Tennessee license number who were employed in a Tennessee public school in the first, second, or third year following program completion or, in the case of job-embedded candidates, following program enrollment.</p> <p>This metric is calculated by dividing employed individuals (see description below) by the total number of individuals from cohorts 1, 2 and 3 who obtained a Tennessee teaching license.</p> <p>Employed individuals included in the numerator for this metric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Individuals reported in cohort 1 who were employed in the 2014-15, 2015-16, or 2016-17 academic years;</li><li>• Individuals reported in cohort 2 in a job-embedded clinical practice who were employed in the 2014-15, 2015-16, or 2016-17 academic years;</li></ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 2 in a student teaching or internship clinical practice who were employed in the 2015-16 or 2016-17 academic years;</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 3 in a job-embedded clinical practice who were employed in the 2015-16, or 2016-17 academic years; and</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 3 in a student teaching or internship clinical practice who were employed in the 2016-17 academic year.</li> </ul>
<b><i>First Year Employment Rate</i></b>	<i>Percentage employed in first year</i>	<p>This metric is calculated by dividing the number of individuals employed (see description below) by the total number of individuals from the cohorts 1, 2 and 3 who obtained a Tennessee teaching license and had the potential to be employed for a single year (see description below).</p> <p>Employed individuals included in the numerator for this metric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 1 who were employed in the 2014-15 academic year;</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 2 in a job-embedded clinical practice who were employed in the 2014-15 academic year;</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 2 in a student teaching or internship clinical practice who were employed in the 2015-16 academic year;</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 3 in a job-embedded clinical practice who were employed in the 2015-16 academic year; and</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 3 in a student teaching or internship clinical practice who were employed in the 2016-17 academic year.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Two year retention rate</i></b>	<i>Percentage retained for two years</i>	<p>This metric is calculated by dividing individuals employed for two years (see description below) by the number of individuals who were employed for one year, with the potential to be employed a second year (see description below).</p> <p>Employed individuals included in the numerator for this metric:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 1 who were employed for two years within a three year period (the 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 academic years) ;</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 2 in a job-embedded clinical practice who were employed for two years within a three year period (the 2014-15 , 2015-16, and 2016-17 academic years);</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 2 in a student teaching or internship clinical practice who were employed for two years within a two year period (the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic years); and</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 3 in a job-embedded clinical practice who were employed for two years within a two year period (the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic years).</li> </ul> <p>Individuals included in the denominator for this metric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 1 who were employed in either the 2014-15 or 2015-16 academic years;</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 2 in a job-embedded clinical practice who were employed in either the 2014-15 or 2015-16 academic years;</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 2 in a student teaching or internship clinical practice who were employed in the 2015-16 academic year; and</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 3 in a job-embedded clinical practice who were employed in the 2015-16 academic year.</li> </ul>
<b>Three year retention rate</b>	<i>Percentage retained for three years</i>	<p>This metric is calculated by dividing individuals employed for three years (see description below) by the number of individuals who were employed for two years, with the potential to be employed a third year (see description below).</p> <p>Employed individuals included in the numerator for this metric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 1 who were employed for three years within a three year period (the 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 academic years);</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 2 in a job-embedded clinical practice who were employed for three years within a three year period (the 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 academic years);</li> </ul> <p>Individuals included in the denominator for this metric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 1 who were employed in both the 2014-15 and 2015-16 academic years;</li> <li>• Individuals reported in cohort 2 in a job-embedded clinical practice who were employed in both the 2014-15 and 2015-16 academic years;</li> </ul>
--	--	--



## Insights Tool

### Domain 3: Candidate Assessment

#### General Notes

- Data for this domain were collected from the EPP or ETS.

**Table 4: Insights Tool - Domain 3: Metric label and definition**

Subdomain	Metric Label and Definition	
<b>Pedagogical Assessment</b>	<i>Average edTPA score</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the sum of reported edTPA scores by the total number of individuals with a reported edTPA score.
	<i>Percentage passed: Principles of Learning and Teaching</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the number of passing scores for each Principles of Learning and Teaching assessment by the total number of Principles of Learning and Teaching scores reported. If an individual attempted an assessment multiple times, the first two attempts are included in the calculation.
<b>Literacy Assessment</b>	<i>Percentage passed Reading: Elementary Education and Percentage passed Reading Across the Curriculum: Elementary</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the number of passing scores for each assessment by the total number of scores reported. If an individual attempted an assessment multiple times, the first two attempts are included in the calculation.
<b>Specialty Area Assessment</b>	<i>Percentage of completers passing required specialty area assessments</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the number of passing scores for each assessment by the total number of scores reported. If an individual attempted an assessment multiple times, the first two attempt is included in the calculation.

#### Additional Metric-Specific Information

##### *Percentage passed: Principles of Learning and Teaching*

- These data were collected from the ETS Data Manager system and include all assessment attempts reported based on candidates' requests to have scores sent to the department or candidates' identification of a Tennessee EPP as the "Attending Institution."

*Percentage passed Reading: Elementary Education*

- This metric includes all scores reported on the following assessments:
  - Reading: Elementary Education, and
  - Reading Across the Curriculum: Elementary
- These data were collected from the ETS Data Manager system and include all assessment attempts reported based on candidates' requests to have scores sent to the department or candidates' identification of a Tennessee EPP as the "Attending Institution."

*Percentage of completers passing required specialty area assessments*

- This metric is based on data from ETS and includes all scores reported for each specialty area (content) assessment.
- These data were collected from the ETS Data Manager system and include all assessment attempts reported based on candidates' requests to have scores sent to the department or candidates' identification of a Tennessee EPP as the "Attending Institution."
- In some cases, individuals take assessments that are not associated for endorsements related to the specific programs in which they are/were enrolled by an EPP. To address this, assessments that were not required for endorsements related to a candidate/completer program area are excluded from these analyses.

## Insights Tool

### Domain 4: Completer, Employer, and Partner Satisfaction

**Table 5: Insights Tool - Domain 4: Metric label and definition**

Subdomain	Metric Label and Definition	
<b>LEA Partner Satisfaction</b>	<i>Overall satisfaction with the EPP and the quality of the partnership with the EPP</i>	This metric is reported simply as the number of respondents who indicated satisfaction or agreement with the proposed statement out of all respondents who completed the survey.  LEA partners are disaggregated by either primary partner or other partner. The designation of primary partner is based on EPP-reported LEA primary partners.
<b>Employer Satisfaction</b>	N/A	This metric is not included in the 2016-17 Annual Reports.
<b>Completer Satisfaction</b>	<i>Percentage of novice teachers indicating they were well-prepared</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the number of completers who selected <i>somewhat</i> or <i>well-prepared</i> when responding to each item by the number of completers responding to each item.

#### Additional Metric-Specific Information

##### *LEA Partner Satisfaction*

- These metrics are based on data obtained from the fall 2017 *District Survey*. Districts responded to questions about their overall satisfaction and quality of their partnerships with multiple EPPs. Districts completed surveys about an EPP if at least one of the following conditions were met:
  - The EPP reported the LEA as a primary partner, or
  - The district independently indicated the EPP is a partner on the *District Survey*.
- The District Survey was administered in November and December 2017. Districts were responsible for selecting the individual who was most appropriate to respond to questions on the survey. In some cases, this was the director of schools, while in other cases, it was other relevant personnel.
- Not all districts responded to questions related to educator preparation providers. In addition, districts had the ability to indicate which EPPs they were considering when responding to relevant questions. As a result, these data are not inclusive of all district and EPP partnerships.

### *Completer Satisfaction*

- These metrics are based on data obtained from the April 2017 *Tennessee Educator Survey*. Teachers had the opportunity to identify themselves as novice educators when beginning the survey. Based on this identification, novice educators were asked a series of questions about their preparation experiences. In addition, Novice educators responded to questions about their perceptions of the quality of preparation they received at their EPP, including overall perceptions, perceptions based on clinical experiences and coursework. Surveys were distributed through email to all Tennessee educators. For more information on the survey, visit the [survey website](#).
- The department matched survey responses to teacher license numbers. This data was then matched with cohort 1, 2, and 3 files to calculate these metrics.

# Insights Tool

## Domain 5: Completer Effectiveness

### General Notes

- All metrics in this domain are based on data obtained from the state evaluation database (TNCompass).
- If an individual had a level of overall effectiveness (LOE), TVAAS, or observation rating, they are included in the relevant metric. It is possible that an individual does not have all three of these three data points, but is included in an evaluation metric for which there is data.
- If an individual had a multi-year composite TVAAS value, this value is used in TVAAS calculations, otherwise the single-year TVAAS value is used.
- The overall distribution of ratings (such as LOE, TVAAS, and observation) includes data from all approved models (TEAM, TEM, and Project COACH) recorded in the state evaluation database. Data from TEM and Project COACH are not included in domain and indicator observation ratings as individual observation data are not currently recorded in the state evaluation database.
- Only educators who held a Tennessee license and were observed on the TEAM rubric in 2014-15, 2015-16, or 2016-17 are included in the domain and indicator average metrics.
- Average scores across all observation metrics are converted to whole numbers using the same process used in the TEAM evaluation model. The range conversion is as follows:

**Table 6: TEAM Score Conversion**

Average Score	Corresponding Level
Less than 2	Level 1
Greater than or equal to 2 and less than 2.75	Level 2
Greater than or equal to 2.75 and less than 3.5	Level 3
Greater than or equal to 3.5 and less than 4.25	Level 4
Greater than or equal to 4.25 and less than or equal to 5	Level 5

**Table 7: Insights Tool - Domain 5: Metric label and definition**

Subdomain	Metric Label and Definition	
<b>Overall Evaluation Ratings</b>	<i>Percentage of completers with level of overall effectiveness (LOE) of Level 3 or higher</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of LOE ratings of 3 or higher obtained by individuals in cohorts 1, 2, and 3 by the total number of LOE ratings obtained by individuals from cohorts 1, 2, and 3 who held a license and had an LOE in the state evaluation database.
	<i>Distribution of overall evaluation ratings</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the number of each LOE rating (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) obtained by individuals in cohorts 1, 2, and 3 by the total number of by individuals from cohorts 1, 2, and 3 who held a license and had an LOE in the state evaluation database.
<b>TVAAS Ratings</b>	<i>Percentage of completers with TVAAS of Level 3 or higher</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of individuals with a TVAAS rating of 3 or higher by the total number of individuals who held a license and had a TVAAS rating in the state evaluation database.
	<i>Distribution of TVAAS ratings</i>	The distribution of TVAAS ratings metric is calculated by dividing the number of individuals who earned each TVAAS rating (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) by the number of individuals who held a license and had a TVAAS rating in the state evaluation database.
<b>Observation Ratings</b>	<i>Percentage of completers with observation of Level 3 or higher</i>	This metric is calculated by dividing the total number of observation ratings of 3 or higher obtained by individuals in cohorts 1, 2, and 3 by the total number of observation ratings obtained by individuals from cohorts 1, 2, and 3 who held a license and had an observation rating in the state evaluation database.
	<i>Distribution of observation ratings</i>	The distribution of observation ratings metric is calculated by dividing the number of individuals who earned each observation rating (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) by the number of observation ratings obtained by individuals from cohorts 1, 2, and 3 who held a license and had an observation rating in the state evaluation database.
<b>Average Observation Domain Scores</b>	<i>Average Instruction, Environment, and Planning scores</i>	This metric is calculated first at the individual educator level by dividing the sum of all indicator scores within each domain and dividing by the total number of indicators scored within each domain. The average obtained at the educator level for each domain is then converted to a whole number.

		Once each educator's domain average is calculated, the final metrics are calculated by dividing the sum of all educator domain scores by the number of individuals with a domain score on record.
<b><i>Average Observation Indicator Scores</i></b>	<i>Average scores for all indicators within domains</i>	<p>This metric is calculated first at the individual educator level by dividing the sum of all indicator scores within each indicator and dividing by the total number of times an educator was observed on each indicator. The average obtained at the educator level for each indicator is then converted to a whole number.</p> <p>Once each educator's indicator average is calculated, the final metrics are calculated by dividing the sum of all educator indicator scores by the number of individuals with an indicator score on record.</p>

## ***Annual Reports – Performance Report***

The 2017 Performance Report was developed as an accountability tool to assess educator preparation provider effectiveness on key metrics across four domains (the 2017 Performance Report does not include metrics for Domain 4). These metrics were identified in collaboration with the Educator Preparation Working Group (EPWG) after analysis of historical data and determination of appropriate thresholds. Within each of the four domains, in collaboration with the EPWG, the department analyzed historical data to establish thresholds for metrics, domains, and overall expectations for EPPs.

### **Domains, Metrics, and Metric Expectations**

The following tables outline the domains and metrics included on the 2017 Performance Report.

**Table 8: Performance Report – Domains, Metrics, and Metric Expectations**

Domain 1: Candidate Recruitment and Selection	
Metric	Expectation
Percentage of undergraduate candidates meeting an admissions assessment expectation	95 percent of candidates obtained a 21 ACT, 1020 SAT, or passed all Praxis Core exams
Percentage of candidates meeting the minimum undergraduate GPA expectation	95 percent of candidates were admitted with an undergraduate GPA of 2.75 or higher
Average undergraduate GPA	Average undergraduate GPA is at or above 3.0
Percentage of completers from an underrepresented racial/ethnic group	Positive growth over time (2013-14 compared to 2015-16) or 22 percent of completers come from an underrepresented racial/ethnic group
Percentage of completers who are male	Positive growth over time (2013-14 compared to 2015-16) or 22 percent of completers are male
Percentage of completers who receive a high-needs endorsement	Positive growth over time (2013-14 compared to 2015-16) or the EPP is in the 75th percentile (or higher) for production of educators who receive a high-needs endorsement



Domain 2: Employment and Retention	
Metric	Expectation
Percentage of completers employed for at least two years	85 percent of completers are employed for at least two years

Domain 3: Candidate Assessment	
Metric	Expectation
Percentage of completers who pass the required pedagogical assessment	90 percent of completers pass the required pedagogical assessment within two attempts
Percentage of completers who pass a required literacy assessment	90 percent of completers pass the required literacy assessment within two attempts
Percentage of completers who pass required specialty area assessments	90 percent of completers pass the required specialty area assessment(s) within two attempts

Domain 4: Completer, Partner, and Employer Satisfaction
This domain is not currently included on the Performance Report. In the coming year, the department plans to develop, validate, and deploy surveys that will ultimately be included in the Performance Report.

Domain 5: Completer Effectiveness and Impact	
Metric	Expectation
Percentage of level of overall effectiveness (LOE) ratings at or above 3	85 percent of LOE ratings are 3 or higher
Percentage of TVAAS ratings at or above 3	Percentage of TVAAS ratings of 3 or higher meets or exceeds the state average
Percentage of observation ratings at or above 3	90 percent of observation ratings are 3 or higher

### Performance Report – Domain and Overall expectations

The 2017 Performance Report applies the established thresholds for meeting expectations for each domain and overall expectations. To meet expectations at the domain level, an EPP must meet expectations on the required number of key metrics. The required number of key metrics varies depending on the number of metrics within each domain. To meet expectations at the overall level, an EPP must meet expectations on the required number of domains. In addition, for an EPP to meet overall expectations, an EPP must meet expectations for domain 5.

The following table provides details regarding expectations for each domain and overall.

**Table 9: Performance Report – Domain and Overall Expectations**

Performance Report – Overall Expectations			
Domain	Number of metrics	Standard for meeting Expectations	Notes
<b>Overall Expectations</b>	Four domains	<p>An EPP must meet three of four domains to meet expectations, one of which must be domain five</p> <p>If an EPP has three domains reported, the EPP must meet all three domains, one of which must be domain five</p> <p>An EPP must have at least three domains scored to be evaluated at the overall level</p>	<p>Domain five <i>must</i> meet expectations in order for an EPP to meet overall expectations.</p> <p>To meet expectations for domain 5, an EPP must meet two of three metrics <b>or</b> meet the TVAAS metric.</p>

**Table 10: Performance Report – Domain Expectations**

Performance Report – Domain Expectations			
Domain	Number of metrics	Standard for meeting Expectations	Notes
Domain 1: <b>Candidate Profile</b>	Six	An EPP must meet four of the six metrics to meet expectations	<p>If an EPP has fewer than six metrics reported, a scaled set of expectations (shown below) has been established</p> <p>If an EPP has five metrics reported, then expectations for three metrics must be met</p> <p>If an EPP has four metrics reported, EPP must meet expectations for three metrics</p> <p>If an EPP has three or fewer metrics reported, EPP will not be evaluated on domain one</p>
Domain 2: <b>Candidate Retention</b>	One	An EPP must meet the expectation for this metric to meet expectations	If an EPP is not scored (due to low N count) for this domain, the domain will not count towards the overall expectations
Domain 3: <b>Candidate Assessment</b>	Three	An EPP must meet two of three metrics to meet expectations	If an EPP has fewer than three metrics reported, a scaled set of expectations has been established

			<p>If an EPP has three metrics reported, EPP must meet expectations for two of the reported metrics</p> <p>If an EPP has two metrics reported, EPP must meet expectations for both metrics reported</p> <p>If an EPP has fewer than two metrics reported, EPP will not be evaluated at the domain level</p>
Domain 4: <b>Completer Satisfaction</b>	N/A	This domain is not currently included on the Performance Report. In the coming year, the department plans to develop, validate, and deploy surveys that will be eventually be included in the Performance Report.	
Domain 5: <b>Candidate Effectiveness and Impact</b>	Three	An EPP must meet two of three metrics or meet the TVAAS metric to meet expectations	<p>If an EPP has only two metrics reported, EPP must meet expectations for two reported metrics</p> <p>If an EPP has only one metric reported, EPP will not be evaluated on domain five</p> <p>Or</p> <p>EPP may meet expectations for domain five by meeting expectations for TVAAS</p>